

Commissioners of St. Mary's County Meeting Minutes (Tuesday, October 27, 2015)

Generated by Sharon Ferris on Thursday, October 29, 2015

Members present

Commissioner President James R. Guy
Commissioner Michael L. Hewitt
Commissioner Tom Jarboe,
Commissioner Todd B. Morgan
Commissioner John E. O'Connor
Dr. Rebecca Bridgett, County Administrator
Sharon Ferris, Recorder

1. WELCOME

Commissioner President Guy called the meeting to order at 9:00 in the Chesapeake Building meeting room, Governmental Center.

Approval of Minutes

I move to approve the minutes of October 20, 2015 as presented.

Motion by Commissioner Tom Jarboe, second by Commissioner Michael L. Hewitt.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Commissioners Guy, Hewitt, Jarboe, Morgan, O'Connor

2. PROCLAMATION

1. A proclamation was presented for National Disability Employment Awareness Month
2. A Proclamation was presented to Joseph C. Bean on the occasion of his retirement.

3. COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

A. DRAFT Agendas for November 3 and 10, 2015

B. BOARD OF EDUCATION - FY2016 Budget Amendment for Technology

Present: Mr. Scott Smith, Superintendent
Dr. Jeff Walker, Assistant Superintendent of Supporting Services
Ms. Tammy McCourt

Mr. Smith noted the St. Mary's County Public School system has an unassigned fund balance of \$1.9 million. Dr. Walker explained the need to provide technology upgrades in elementary schools. The goal is to have three student computers, one teacher computer and an interactive whiteboard in each classroom. The \$1.9 million will be used to fund these computers. Ms. McCourt identified the areas in which the savings occurred.

Commissioner Morgan noted his constituents have been asking how the public school system could go from a \$500,000 deficit to a surplus in such a short time.

Commissioner Hewitt indicated he was concerned with the number of students projected for next FY versus the number of students the County funded through Maintenance of Effort this year. Mr. Smith noted he expects 75 full time students, but no more than 100.

I move that we approve the increase in the Board of Educations FY2016 Revenue and Expense budget, to use \$1.9 million in St. Mary's County Public Schools Unassigned Fund Balance for Technology Improvements in FY2016 as approved by the Board of Education at their October 14, 2015 meeting; and execute the letter to the Board of Education supporting this action.

Motion by Commissioner Michael L. Hewitt, second by Commissioner Tom Jarboe.

Final Resolution: Motion carries

Yea: Commissioners Guy, Hewitt, Jarboe, Morgan, O'Connor

C. DEPT. OF RECREATION AND PARKS - 4-ACES 21st Century Grant Award

I move to approve the 4-ACES 21st Century Grant Award from the St. Mary's County Public Schools, on behalf of the Department of Recreation and Parks, in the total amount of \$135,600 for the Carver Recreation Center Afterschool Program, and the related budget amendment to decrease the program budget by \$283 to match the award, and authorize the Commissioner President to execute the related documents.

Motion by Commissioner John E. O'Connor, second by Commissioner Michael L. Hewitt.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Commissioners Guy, Hewitt, Jarboe, Morgan, O'Connor

D. DEPT. OF RECREATION AND PARKS - Modification No. 4 to U.S. Government Contract No. N62477-98-RP-00055

I move to approve Modification No. 004 to the U.S. Government Lease N62477-98-RP-00055 to change the lessee from the Board of County Commissioners of St. Mary's County to the Commissioners of St. Mary's County and to allow construction of a 23' x 16' shelter near the children's playground at John G. Lancaster Park, and authorize the Commissioner President to execute the related documents.

Motion by Commissioner John E. O'Connor, second by Commissioner Tom Jarboe.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Commissioners Guy, Hewitt, Jarboe, Morgan, O'Connor

E. DEPT. OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT - Proposed St. Mary's County Agriculture Tourism Signing Program

I move to adopt the Resolution establishing the St. Mary's County Ag-Tourism Signage Program.

Motion by Commissioner Tom Jarboe, second by Commissioner Todd B. Morgan.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Commissioners Guy, Hewitt, Jarboe, Morgan, O'Connor

4. MAIN AGENDA ACTION ITEM

A. ST. MARY'S COUNTY HEALTH DEPT. - Proposed Environmental Health Fees Increase

Present: Meenakshi Brewster, MD, MPH, FAAFP, Health Officer SMC

Daryl W. Calvano, Director, Environmental Health, SMC Health Department

Dr. Brewster noted that fees have been flat since 2007. County population has grown 13% since 2007, Environmental Health has seen a 50% increase of service units delivered since 2007, and Environmental Health staff had a decrease of two FTEs since 2007 though cost of compensation continues to rise. The fee change will contribute to initiatives designed to improve workforce efficiency, make records available electronically to the public, and improve communications with clients and partners.

I move to sign the Resolution approving the fees for the St. Mary's County Department of Health, Office of Environmental Health, as presented.

Motion by Commissioner Todd B. Morgan, second by Commissioner Tom Jarboe.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Commissioners Guy, Jarboe, Morgan

Nay: Commissioners Hewitt, O'Connor

5. COMMISSIONER'S TIME

The Commissioners highlighted events attended over the past week and provided general comments.

6. PUBLIC HEARING #1

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR - Public Hearing on Non-Profit Policy

Commissioner Guy opened the public hearing at 10:15 am.

Present: Dr. Rebecca Bridgett, County Administrator

Jeannett Cudmore, CFO

Dr. Bridgett noted the Commissioners were presented with the draft of the proposed Non-Profit Policy on October 20, 2015. Notice of public hearing was posted in *The Enterprise Newspaper* on October 21 and 23, 2015, and a news release was submitted by the Public Information Officer. The Commissioners will be making a decision on five content categories and six funding options. This public hearing is to gather community input on the choices. Following today's public hearing, the Commissioners will entertain a resolution. The decision will assist finance staff in outlining the parameters of the Governor's Office for Crime Control and Prevention (GOCCP) software received from the State in preparation for the

FY2017 budget year. The final submissions will be presented to the Commissioners as part of the normal budget process.

Commissioner Guy opened the hearing for public comments.

Public Comments (Comments as noted below are intended as highlights of testimony given and are not verbatim)

Gary Lynch, P. O. Box 827, Leonardtown MD

- Agree with the vision – need to look at high quality, cost-effective, efficient service
- Proposal should be inclusive – and apples to apples oranges to oranges
- Should be data driven
- We have five grants using GOCCP model

James Bershon, 41328 Breton Beach Rd., Leonardtown, MD 20650

- Treasurer and Vice President St. Mary's Caring for 17 years. St. Mary's Caring operates the only Soup Kitchen in the county
- Have filled out county grant applications for years and turned in our required 99 detached forms to the Finance Office, so I am confused when someone in government says they don't know how we spent our grant money when we completed the forms. Hopefully, new form will alleviate this problem.
- Explained the increase in number of meals provided from 2007 (9,400) to 2014 (24,800)
- We provide a safety net for County residents
- County funding has not changed for years – our grant needs have increased

Karen White, 44680 Clarks Landing Rd., Hollywood, MD 20636

- Explained that the Center for Life Enrichment provides valuable services to St. Mary's County.
- Saw an article in the paper that we receive \$150,900 in funding. \$63,000 of that we don't see a dime of as it goes to State as a matching fund. \$87,000 goes towards transports. We transport 250 individuals on a daily basis, and most of that is door to door transportation. If the Center loses County funding, individuals will have to rely on public transportation, and the I do not think the County would be able to provide all of the same services
- Agree with the need to change way money is applied for - hope it works out for the best

Joe Anderson, 45870 Booth Rd., Drayden, MD 20630

- Moving towards a policy is a positive step - hope it is the first step in a series of tweaks
- New process, new policy -- it's a change and going to require help from your employees
- Training is important to new policy and process-- requested County staff provide training to the non-profits
- Think it will be more equitable and transparent means of how County spends tax dollars as the policy matures
- We are essentially small businesses here that hire people, pay taxes, mortgages on our homes, and are a very active part of the County
- Think this will be a work in process
- Need you to provide and identify requirements in objective way
- Funds spent should be based on real pragmatic services that can be provided by organizations
- Need to be able to identify requirements in an objective way and figure out how we are going to meet those needs – county government, organizations or businesses in community
- We need to know the requirements
- Program will help in projecting how you spend money
- All non-profits look forward to working with you

Laura Joyce, 28918 Mervell Dean Rd., Hollywood, MD 20636

- Executive Director of Southern Maryland Center for Family Advocacy
- Noted all the services provided by the Center
- Over the years two things have stayed the same needs (homelessness, hunger, domestic violence, sexual assault etc.) and funding.
- Strongest community is one where there is a recognition of the needs of less fortunate and partnership with non-profit providers – we are a team
- We want partnership
- Open to reporting
- Have used the GOCCP software

Robert Randall, 19711 Teddy Way, Lexington Park, MD 20653

- Thanks for working towards rational process for supporting non-profits
- Programs of non-profits are a fine way of leveraging funds
- Priorities should be set by Department Heads
- Think option model that is most reasonable is placing responsibility with Department Heads
- Would like to see a provision when setting up software for pop-up or pilot programs not currently listed - programs by virtue of a competitive process
- Hope it will be simplistic

- Option with vetting the process through an advisory board – have concerns that there can be conflicts of interest
- Want training provided
- Determine how you are going to prioritize funding
- Lack of data to describe the need/demands for long term services - you should provide us with the needs

NKeshi Free, The Arc of Southern MD, P.O. Box 1600, Prince Frederick MD

- Representing Arc of Southern Maryland serving the intellectually disabled.
- Recapped services the Arc provides and their impact they have on the County
- Sixty full-time employees in St. Mary’s County who give back to community by living in the County, working and paying taxes, etc.
- Own and provide housing for individuals with need
- Arc is not looking for a hand out. This is an agency that has hands in – an example we provide small nursing grants. Last two recipients were St. Mary’s County residents

7. RECESS/LUNCH

8. OUTSIDE EVENT

The Commissioners attended a Groundbreaking for the College of Southern MD Regional Campus and the Center for Trades and Energy Training in Hughesville.

9. PUBLIC HEARING #2

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR - Public Hearing on Non-Profit Policy

Present: Dr. Rebecca Bridgett, County Administrator
Jeannett Cudmore, CFO

Commissioner President Guy opened the Public Hearing at 6:30 pm. Ms. Cudmore advised that the Notice of public hearing was posted in *The Enterprise Newspaper* on October 21 and 23, 2015, and a news release was submitted by the Public Information Officer. The Commissioners will be making a decision on five content categories and six funding options. This public hearing is to gather community input on the choices. Following today's public hearing, the Commissioners will entertain a resolution. The decision will assist finance staff in outlining the parameters of the Governor’s Office for Crime Control and Prevention (GOCCP) software received from the State in preparation for the FY2017 budget year. The final submissions will be presented to the Commissioners as part of the normal budget process.

Commissioner Guy opened the hearing for public comments.

Public Comments (Comments as noted below are intended as highlights of testimony given and are not verbatim)

John Hartline, Executive Director, Tri County Council, 15045 Burnt Store Rd., Hughesville

- Favor Category Option C1 (keeping current system).
- Funding Categories F2 or F4 would be good options. When you get a variety of diverse program areas that are presented, sometimes the expertise doesn't exist with small committees to analyze a large number of program areas. Strongly suggest that you not use Charles County as a model as process is onerous, lengthy, no reanalysis when decision was made to cut budget – all cut the same amount.

Susan Wolfe, 19221 Nelson Ct., Valley Lee, Executive Director, SMC Historical Society

- Preparation of materials for the 2017 County budget call is close at hand and concerned may not be adequate training time for the new software not only for County nonprofits but for County staff as well.
- We prefer the department-driven option for at least FY 2017.
- We believe we fall under three departments (Tourism, DED, LUGM). Suggest that LUGM document, Painting a Self-Portrait: A Historic Preservation Plan for St. Mary's County(March 2000), be included in the Plans List as distributed last week.
- Regarding funding -- our concerns with directorate model are: how would these three directorates cooperate to assure complete decisions regarding our operations? If you would choose to place us under one directorate, how would our responsibilities under the other two be included in the grant decision-making process and ultimate award?

Janice Walthour, 20493 Parton's Lane, Lexington Park, speaking on behalf of Unified Committee for Afro-American Contributions

- Prefer Funding Model Option 4- Hybrid.
- Concur with Vital Community Connectors about need for community needs assessment.
- UCAC is a small organization. With application process, look at organizations that may not be writing big grants – do a variety of grants – one size doesn't fit all. The idea of collecting Afro-American history has not been well documented, so it's important to be inclusive and open doors to everyone to submit grants.
- Return on investment: When looking at categories, make history a strong part – both documenting and celebrating through events like Juneteenth.

Julie Randall, 19711 Teddy Way, Lexington Park

- Category Model Options: Current six funding categories are representative of the majority of funding areas County would require from non-profits and also map back to the County's Comprehensive Plan. All funding should be tied to the Comprehensive

Plan. Additional categories could be added should they be needed at a later date. Would not preclude targeting.

- Funding Model Options: Citizens best served by Option 2, Department Model. Puts accountability for identifying and analyzing and meeting total needs and requirements as outlined in the Comprehensive Plan in a structure that already exists and whose leadership has knowledge of the individual funding areas. Gives you the opportunity to set goals for the Departments that include best use of non-profits in meeting total requirements and promotes partnerships between County government and the community.
- Caveats regarding Funding Option 2: 1. Departments should be charged to garner a complete understanding of the total County requirements in their departmental areas – this requirements gathering will take time and effort on the part of the Department heads and they will need support from the Commissioners and the County Administrator in order to get their hands around the total picture in each of the affected departments 2. Must provide for new non-profits to provide proposals for the Department’s review. 3. Should be a requirement for the Departments to keep metrics on total requirements and how well they are fulfilling those requirements through all means, including non-profit participation, will be needed to monitor this process and ensure it’s working.
- Concerns regarding other models:
 - Grants Model – Option 1. Difficult to administer due to real or perceived conflicts of interest. Difficult to find members in County who are knowledgeable enough about requirements who are not associated with one of the non-profits applying. Setting a budget up front for non-profits is not a meaningful solution until you have access to the total requirements based on community need.
 - Advisory Board Model - Option 3. Also difficult to administer –real or perceived conflicts of interest and difficult to maintain representation on the multiple boards and committees now, so asking the Advisory Boards to make recommendations would not be best solution. Propose they be involved in the process via department heads.
 - Hybrid Model - Option 4. While some aspects offer flexibility, concerned about idea of setting a “base” funding level for non-profits based upon continued leveraging of other grant funds. If you limit the base funding level to existing leverage opportunities, you’ve not opened the door to accepting new non-profit grant requests with County match requirements. Puts you in the position of supporting non-profit requests based upon history and not necessarily based upon comprehensive County requirements in the individual funding categories.

Laura Joyce, 23918 Mervell Dean Rd., Hollywood, Director, Center for Family Advocacy

- Prefer Funding Model Option F2 as first option, and F4 as second. Department heads are more familiar with their subject areas and assume are better able to gauge the effectiveness and necessity of the services.
- Experience with Charles County grants panel and advisory board has not been positive – found it to be biased.

- Center for Family Advocacy has been using GOCAP grants management system and while cumbersome at the start, after the first complete grant cycle, it becomes extremely user-friendly. We and other non-profits who have been using the system would be good resources for those new to the process.

Steve Cricchi, 23686 J.M. Gough Ct., Leonardtown, President, Board of Directors, Tri County Youth Services Bureau

- Agree with Julie Randall's comments.
- Prefer Category Model Option 1 (current).
- Prefer Funding Model Option F2 with one additional comment: It should be made very to those competing for this funding that the framework for decision making is based on identifying priorities of the department (as it states in literature), and as long as those priorities are very clear to the non-profits that would be competing, then that's the option we recommend.

George Hurlbert, 44491 Whitestone Place, Tall Timbers, representing the Vital Community Connections Steering Committee

Offer three suggestions:

- As you are moving from leadership to management, important to have that information by which decisions can be made. Management works on metrics: good metrics mean good decisions. And decisions are often cross-cutting across department lines, so essential to change mindset to build metrics necessary to understand the dimensions of problems with which we are facing. Without metrics it is difficult to assess any kind of redundancy or need, because the need is unknown.
- Organizational linkages to non-profits are very important consideration. You will see cross cutting. There will be linkages requiring cross talk between those organizational elements to be able to effectively articulate the grants going forward in the software. Don't look at it as cookie cutter, but cross-cutting.
- Process should drive the software – software should not drive the process.

Nancy Easterling, Executive Director, Sotterley Plantation

- Agree with Mr. Hurlbert.
- Needs to be a community needs assessment.
- Many organizations (such as Sotterley) don't really fit cleanly into one category. Sotterley easily aligns with Economic Development, Tourism, School Programs, LUGM, and Recreation and Parks; however, the Department Head model is probably the best way of assessing our organization.
- Regarding matching: Your funding makes a big difference – we leverage your dollars even if not always matching a particular grant.

There were no others wishing to speak. Commissioner President Guy closed the hearing for public comments at 6:40 pm.